

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/769,483	01/30/2004	Robert E. Clark	Duby/Clark-CIP	8748
22536	7590 07/06/2006		EXAMINER	
KNECHTEL DEMEUR & SAMLAN			BIANCO, PATRICIA	
ATTN: ALAN B. SAMLAN 222 S. RIVERSIDE, SUITE 1410			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
CHICAGO, II			3761	

DATE MAILED: 07/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			T	<u> </u>
		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Antina Commence		10/769,483	CLARK, ROBERT E.	
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	-	Patricia M. Bianco	3761	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Ensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. It period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period re to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statutely received by the Office later than three months after the mailing patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status				
2a) <u></u> ☐	Since this application is in condition for allowa	s action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, pro		
	closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1955 C.D. 11, 45)3 O.G. 213.	
Dispositi	on of Claims			
5)⊠ 6)⊠ 7)⊠ 8)⊡ Applicat	Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) 20-22 is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-8,10-17 and 19 is/are rejected. Claim(s) 1,9-11 and 13-19 is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/ ion Papers The specification is objected to by the Examin	awn from consideration. or election requirement.		
·	The drawing(s) filed on <u>30 January 2004</u> is/ard Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	e drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority (ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12)[a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documer 2. Certified copies of the priority documer 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applicat ority documents have been receive au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage	
2) Notice 3) Infor	et(s) se of References Cited (PTO-892) se of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 ser No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:		

Art Unit: 3761

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

Applicant has indicated co-pending applications in the first paragraph of the specification. The first page of the specification should be updated to clarify the status of all related applications noted in the first paragraph of the specification. The status of nonprovisional parent application(s) (whether patented or abandoned) should also be included. If a parent application has become a patent, the expression "now Patent No.______" should follow the filing date of the parent application. If a parent application has become abandoned, the expression "now abandoned" should follow the filing date of the parent application.

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: It is the Examiner's position that Applicant has evoked sixth paragraph, means-plusfunction language to define Applicant's invention.

Applicant uses the following means-plus-function language: "means for drawing and transporting fluid through cuvette;" "means for receiving the fluid transported and irradiated through the cuvette;" "means for enclosing the cuvette and irradiation station" when in use; "means for energizing the fluid irradiation apparatus"; "means for receiving the fluid transported through the cuvette;" "means for transporting the fluid through the cuvette" into the means for receiving fluid; "means for returning the fluid back through the cuvette" from the means for receiving fluid; "means for drawing and transporting fluid through cuvette;"

"means for enclosing the cuvette and irradiation station" when in use; "means for controlling the operation of the fluid irradiation apparatus."

Therefore the Examiner requires the Applicant to amend the specification pursuant to 37 CFR 1.75(d) and MPEP 608.01(o) to **explicitly state**, with reference to the terms and phrases of the claim element, what structures, materials, and acts perform the function(s) recited in the claim element(s). Please note that the MPEP clearly states, "Even if the disclosure implicitly sets forth the structure, materials, or acts corresponding to the means-(or step-) plusfunction claim element in compliance with 35 U.S.C. 112, first and second paragraphs, the PTO may still require the applicant to amend the specification pursuant to 37 CFR 1.75(d) and MPEP 608.01(o)...". (Also see **MPEP 2181** (Rev. 1, Feb.2000)) *Wolfensperger*, 302 F.2d at 955, 133 USPQ at 542. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

Claims 1, 9-11, & 13-19 are objected to because of the following informalities: It is the Examiner's position that Applicant has evoked sixth paragraph, means-plus-function language to define Applicant's invention.

Therefore, the Examiner has objected to the claims for the reasons set forth above in the objection to the specification.

Appropriate correction is required.

Art Unit: 3761

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35

U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this

Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 3-5, 8, 10-17, & 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Einstein (6,951,548). Einstein discloses a blood irradiating apparatus and method for irradiating blood. The apparatus includes a housing having a cover, an interior side defined in the housing, an irradiation station, and a plurality of UV light bulbs (i.e. at least two UV light sources) disposed adjacent to the plurality of cuvettes. At least one of the bulbs is shown to be in the cover portion of the apparatus. The cuvettes may be made of a strong, translucent material such as glass or high-density plastic. The apparatus may include a blood holding tank for holding untreated blood and one for treated blood and a storage tank for holding treated blood (i.e. means for receiving fluid). The blood is directed to and from the apparatus using tubing structures. The apparatus may include switches for controlling the activation of or the intensity of the individual UV sources. Einstein teaches that the UV may be of a variety of wavelengths or bandwidths. The blood is moved using a conventional pump. See figures 9-10 and col. 4, lines 24 to col. 5, lines 4-38.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2, 6, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Einstein (548), as applied to claim 1 above, in view of Schleicher (6,113,566). Einstein substantially discloses the invention as claimed, and does teaches that the UV may be chosen to be of a variety of wavelengths or band widths; however, with respect to claims 6 and 7, Einstein does not specifically teach that the UV wavelength be UVA, UVB, or UVC and calibrated to be between 40 and 400 nanometers. Also, with respect to claim 2, while Einstein does teach that the cuvette can be made of a strong material, such as glass, it is not taught that the cuvette is made of quartz crystal. Schleicher discloses a UV blood irradiation apparatus for irradiating blood to treat viral and/or bacterial infections comprising a housing having an irradiation station, a cuvette, a UV source, a peristaltic pump for moving fluid through the apparatus into and out of a cuvette, and a cover that encloses the cuvette and irradiating station when in use. Tubing transports and receives the fluid to and from the irradiation station and cuvette. Schleicher teaches that the UV source may be UVA, UVB, or UVC and may have a range of 2,000 Angstroms to 12,000

Art Unit: 3761

Angstroms (200-1,200 nanometers). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have modified the apparatus and method of Einstein to include UV sources to be any or more than one of UVA, UVB, or UVC as taught by Schleicher as a substitution of the generic UV source in Einstein's apparatus, since they are well known UV wavelengths for use in blood treatment. With respect to the specific range of 40-400 nanometers, choosing such a range for the wavelength would have been obvious, since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. In re Boesch, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

With respect to claim 2, it would have been obvious to have made the cuvette of Einstein's apparatus out of quartz crystal (claim 2) since at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to choose the material of quartz crystal for the cuvette, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin,* 125 USPQ 416.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 20-22 are allowed. The subject matter of the independent claims could either not be found or was not suggested in the prior art of record. The subject matter not found was step of reversing the directional flow of the fluid to pass back through the same cuvette and irradiating the first irradiated fluid within

the cuvette to produce a second irradiated fluid in combination with the other elements (or steps) in the claims.

Claims 9 & 18 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

With respect to claim 9, the subject matter not found was the inclusion of an ivac bottle for drawing and transporting fluid through the cuvette in combination with the other elements (or steps) in the claims.

With respect to claim 22, the subject matter not found was the inclusion of a lens covering the second UV light source in combination with the other elements (or steps) in the claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patricia M. Bianco whose telephone number is (571) 272-4940. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 9:00-6:30, alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tatyana Zalukaeva can be reached on (571) 272-1115. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/769,483

Art Unit: 3761

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

June 23rd, 2006

Patricia M Bianco Primary Examiner Art Unit 3761 Page 8

PATRICIA BIANCO
PRIMARY EXAMINER

GIRZIO